Indira Gandhi National Centre for Arts

1806. DR. H. P. SHARMA: Will the Minister of HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT be pleased to state:

(a) what is the progress made so far on the design competition for the construction of Indira Gandhi National Centre for Arts;

(b) What were the main objections raised by the Professional Services Board of the Indian Institute of Architects against the award to a foreign architect;

(c) whether subsequetly other associations of architects have been requested to give their opinion; and

(d) by when a decision is likely to be taken?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION AND CULTURE IN THE MINISTRY OF HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT (SHRIMATI KRISHNA SAHI): (a) An International Architectural Design Competition for the building complex of the Indira Gandhi National Centre for Arts (IGNCA) was launched in November, 1985. An international Jury consisting of eminent architects and scholars was set up to adjudge the design submissions for the competition. The Prime Minister announced the awards, as contained in the report of the international Jury, on the 19th November, 1986.

(b) It is learnt that the Chairman of the Professional Servcies Board of the Indian Institute of Architects had circulated a letter setting out complaints by some Institute members on reported contravention of the competition conditions in awarding the first prize. These complaints have been examined and it is found that they do not vitiate the jury awards, as shown in the statement attached. (*See* below)

(c) and (d) Does not arise.

Statement

Complaint	Remarks
1. The entry was received late.	The vast majority of foreign competitors and several Indians residing in cities other than Delhi despatched their submission materials by courier services. In each case the competition Secretariat required proof that the materials has been despatched on or before October 10, 1986. The first prize winner submission was also similarly checked for date of despatch.
2. The entry was submitted on tracing paper.	All the submissions including several using tracing paper were examined by the Jury. No competitor was disqualified by the Jury for using tracing paper.
3. Inadequatae, incomplete or excessive doucmentation (tucluding site model, site plan, scale of drawings, colour of markings).	The Jury was the sole authority to disqualify any entry for excessive documentation or incomplete documentation. The Jury report clearly indicated that no competitor was disqualified.
4. The dormitory located to overlook Rajpath breaking security provisions.	The residential components of the programme (a few hostal rooms for scholars) represents a very small fraction of total area requirements. The Jury was satisfied that the award winner could easily relocate residential component to meet security requirements. Under Clause 6.3 of the Composition regulations, the Architect has agreed to modify design to meet all reasonable charges, as desired by the Promoter.
5. The Kala Darshana Complex buildings violate height restrictions.	The first prize winner has not violated the height restrictions. His drawing section clearly show that part of the Concert Hall and National Theatre are below ground level.